UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,369	07/14/2004	Norbert Auner	PACO 0101 PUSA	9387
22045 BROOKS KUS	7590 09/29/200 HMAN P.C.	EXAMINER		
1000 TOWN CENTER			ZIMMER, ANTHONY J	
TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/501,369	AUNER, NORBERT			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	ANTHONY J. ZIMMER	1793			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Sec 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 28-53 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 42-53 is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 28-41 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access Applicant may not request that any objection to the or	n from consideration. relection requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the B				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-		•			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	animer. Note the attached Office	Action of formal 10-102.			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's traversal (in the correspondence of 9/10/2008) of the restriction requirement presented in the office action of 9/6/2007 is on the ground(s) that the groups now have a common special technical feature. This is not found persuasive because as can be seen in the 35 USC 102 rejection below, the groups lack unity because the common technical feature(s) of claim 28 is found in the prior art. Thus, the common technical feature is not a special technical feature under PCT Rule 13.2, and therefore the claims lack unity.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

Claim Objections

Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities: There is a grammatical error in the phrase "a solid metal particles."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 31 and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The preamble of claim 31 renders the claim indefinite. The preamble recites, "Further comprising first preparing by one of the following." It is unclear what is being prepared, and when the preparation takes place in relation to the process of claim 28.

Claim 37 recites the limitation "the pressure under which the process is conducted" in the second and third lines of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Dependent claim 38 is rendered indefinite as a result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 28, 30-37, and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hayha '896.

In regard to claims 28, 30-31, and 34-35, HAYHA teaches reducing sodium silicon fluoride (a hexafluorosilicate salt) by heating it to produce silicon tetrafluoride gas and sodium fluoride, and reducing with an alkali or alkaline earth metal dispersed in a liquid intermediate agent, mineral oil, (a nonpolar, organic solvent). See column 2, line 53- column 4, line 6 and Examples.

In regard to claims 32-33, 37, and 40, HAYHA teaches a process of reducing a halosilane (silicon tetrafluoride) in a boiling organic, nonpolar solvent (mineral oil in particular) with molten sodium (or a Group 1 or 2 metal) dispersed and blended

(agitated) in the solvent. Furthermore HAYHA teaches separating the amorphous silicon products from other reaction components. (see Example 1 and claims 1-19).

In regard to claim 36, the sodium reducing agent is added while in the solid state and thus comprises solid metal particles in an organic solvent. See Example 1.

In regard to claim 39, Hayha teaches reacting in a boiling state, i.e. refluxing. See column 3, lines 4-26 and Examples.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 29 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayha '896.

In regard to claim 29, Hayha does not particularly teach the use of silicon tetrachloride.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute one known halosilane for another in order to affect the predictable result of forming silicon, as it is also known (and disclosed in Hayha) that silicon tetrachloride can be reacted with sodium to produce silicon. See column 1, lines 44-47.

In regard to claim 38, HAYHA does not explicitly teach performing the reaction at atmospheric pressure, but one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have envisaged that this is the case, because HAYHA does not mention performing the reaction under pressure or in a vacuum, and atmospheric pressure is standard operating procedure unless otherwise specified.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayha in view of Kotzsch '109.

Hayha fails to teach producing the needed reagent halosilane from crystalline silicon.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hayha in view of Kotzsch, because Kotzsch teaches a method for halosilane production from elemental (crystalline) silicon. See abstract and claims.

One would have been motivated to modify Hayha in view of Kotzsch in order to use the crystalline silicon as a source for the halosilane, produce needed halosilane, purify the crystalline silicon, and to achieve the predictable result of creating amorphous silicon from crystalline silicon.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nanis '181, Sanjurjo '565, and Sanjurjo '783 teach processes of reducing a halosilane with a metal to produce amorphous silicon.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY J. ZIMMER whose telephone number is (571)270-3591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/501,369 Page 6

Art Unit: 1793

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ajz

/Steven Bos/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793